

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
Project Name: Redfield fence installation.	Proposed Implementation Date: Spring 2021
Proponent: Chase Redfield, PO Box 385, Opheim, MT 59250 (lessee of record on Lease No. 5723 and 7038)	
Type and Purpose of Action: The applicant proposes to install 1.25 miles of new 3-strand barbed-wire fence along the northern border of lease 7036 and continues along the southern border of lease 5723. The fence consists of steel posts with 3 barbed wires.	
Location: NE4 & SW4 of Section 8, Township 34N, Range 47E	County: Daniels

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	
1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	The proponent (lessee of record on the tract) plans to install a new fence on the border of the tract after acquiring the lease on this School Trust land. The proponent discussed the project with Glasgow Unit staff, and we agreed on the plan of action to fence and graze the expired CRP acreage.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	DNRC manages the surface of these lands and no other agencies have jurisdiction over the project. No additional permits needed.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	<p>Action Alternative: Grant permission to the applicant to install the new fence on School Trust land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Deny permission to the applicant to install the new fence on School Trust land.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
<p>4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compatible, or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>The soil within the area of impact consists of sandy loams with moderate slopes of 2-8% that are not unusual, fragile, or unstable.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The fence posts would be driven in with light machinery and the wire installed by hand. The posts are driven in about a foot at most and would have no impact on geology or soils.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no changes to soils on the School Trust land.</p>
<p>5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?</p>	<p>No important surface or groundwater resources are present within the area of impact. No water quality standards impact the project.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence would have no impact on the quality, quantity, and distribution of water.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative, there would be no impacts to water quality, quantity, and distribution.</p>
<p>6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed fence project would have no impact on air quality, nor is it influenced by air quality regulations.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no impacts to air quality.</p>
<p>7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>The area of impact is expired Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) acreage to be grazed. The vegetative community consists of non-native grasses and shrubs. No rare plant or cover types are present.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
	<p>Action Alternative: No permanent alteration of the vegetative community is expected to occur.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no impacts to the plant communities on the School Trust land.</p>
<p>8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>The area of impact provides excellent habitat for upland birds and mule deer.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The new fence may slightly change the way wildlife use the area, including changing routes of travel for deer and changing flight paths of upland birds in the area. However, fences are a common occurrence in this general area, and do not change the quality of habitat significantly.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no impacts to the possible use of the School Trust land as wildlife habitat.</p>
<p>9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?</p>	<p>The area of impact is former CRP acreage that may still be used as nesting habitat by upland birds. No wetlands or sensitive habitats are within the area of impact. One specie of special concern is listed as being seasonally present in the area: Ferruginous Hawk.</p> <p>Action Alternative: The new fence would have no significant impacts and no changes to the general habitat in the area would occur.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no impacts to the environmental resources.</p>
<p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical,</p>	

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
archaeological or paleontological resources present?	<p>Action Alternative: The area of impact contains no archaeological or paleontological resources.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impact to historical or archaeological sites under this alternative.</p>
11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	<p>This tract of School Trust land is legally accessible to the public, but tract 5723 is not accessible to the public. Fences are a common sight in this rural area.</p> <p>Action Alternative: There would be a fence where there wasn't before.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no impacts to aesthetics associated with the School Trust land.</p>
12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed project would place no additional demands on any environmental resources in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no additional demands placed on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.</p>
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	<p>Action Alternative: This project would benefit the lessee and Glasgow Unit staff, by allowing for the grazing of livestock in the future.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no impacts to the plans or studies that Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation has on the School Trust land.</p>

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	<p>Action Alternative: The proposed project would not add to human health and safety risks in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there will be no impacts to human health or safety.</p>
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	<p>Action Alternative: The improved fence would add value to the tract and allow for greater control of livestock on both sides of the fence.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no impacts to agricultural activities on the School Trust land.</p>
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move, or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	<p>Action Alternative: The project would not create nor impact any jobs in the area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impact to quantity and distribution of employment under this alternative.</p>
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	<p>Action Alternative: The project would have no impacts on the local and state tax base and tax revenues.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impact to the local and state tax base under this alternative.</p>
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	<p>Action Alternative: The project would not create an additional demand for government services, nor would it impact traffic along existing roads.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this alternative there would be no additional demand for government services.</p>
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State,	

County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	<p>Action Alternative: The project has already cleared State (GUO) management plans before implementation.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: Under this type of alternative there would be no impacts on locally adopted environmental plans and goals.</p>
20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	<p>There is some potential for recreation with lease 7036. However, lease 5723 does not have legal public access.</p> <p>Action Alternative: This fencing project would not impact the recreation potential of the land.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the recreational values associated with the School Trust land under this alternative.</p>
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	<p>Action Alternative: The project would not impact the density and distribution of population and housing.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the density and distribution of population and housing.</p>
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	<p>Action Alternative: The project would not disrupt the traditional lifestyles of the local community.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the social structures under this alternative.</p>
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	<p>Action Alternative: The project would not impact the cultural uniqueness and diversity of this rural area.</p> <p>No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity under this alternative.</p>
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	<p>Action Alternative: The installation of this fence would add value to the</p>

	tract, allow for more options in managing the tract in the future and should improve the lessee's ability to manage the State lease. No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts to the economic circumstances under this alternative.
--	--

EA Checklist Prepared By: s/Luke Gunderson Date: 03/1/2021
Luke Gunderson Land Use Specialist

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Action Alternative
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	No significant impacts expected.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis: <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: Matthew Poole Glasgow Unit Manager
Name Title
s/Matthew Poole\s Date: March 29, 2021
Signature